

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to preclude the construction of the previous claims adopted by the Board of Appeals and as set forth in the current office action. The present claims, as amended, cannot possibly be read on the failure to authenticate of Cromer, because the claims are explicit that no wireless response is received. In Cromer, a response is received but an incorrect password is provided.

Since the present rejection is based on the Board's claim construction, the present rejection fails to make out a *prima facie* case as to the amended claims.

With respect to the issue related to claim 23, it is noted that there is no requirement that anything be defined in the specification. It is submitted that, one skilled in the art would know what a medium is. The specification calls for software, for example at page 5, line 3. One skilled in the art would know that software needs to be stored on some type of storage medium. Therefore reconsideration is requested.

With respect to the § 101 rejection, the claims have been amended. Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 16, 2011

/Timothy N. Trop/
Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]
Attorneys for Intel Corporation